

Mr. Knobbe,

Please review the proposal below, which would define over the prior art of record. Upon further review it appears that the reference to Edwards (4,047,420) is applicable.

The change to claim 5 is to obviate indefiniteness problems. The change to claim 10 is to overcome a reading of Edwards against this claim. The amendment clarifies the inlet and exit openings to specify the function of these openings. This is to prevent a reading on a generic "opening", such as shown by Edwards where the opposed upper and lower portions of the swaging die having "openings" at either end of the swaging die.

The remaining claims are allowable.

Proposal

Claim 5, line 4, change "top surface" to --upper face--.


Line 6, change "surface", first occurrence, to --face--.

Amend claim 10 as follows:

10. (currently amended) A swaging die, comprising:

a lower portion and an upper portion, each of the lower portion and upper portion configured with a cavity that cooperate when juxtaposed on top of one another to form a swaging cavity configured to swage a marker band onto a catheter, the lower and upper portion being movable a distance relative to one another;

a front portion defining an inlet opening a rear portion defining an exit opening, the inlet opening and exit opening aligned to facilitate feed of the catheter through the swaging cavity, each of the front portion and rear portion further defining travel stops that extend above the upper portion and limit the maximum distance between the upper portion and the lower portion.


Daniel C. Crane
Primary Examiner